

Round 2 Prop. 84 IRWM Implementation Proposal Process, Scoring/Ranking Process, & Pre-Proposal Application

Project Review Process & Instructions

General Information and Preparation of Pre-proposals

- You are *strongly* encouraged to review all relevant documents including the *draft* Round II Implementation Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP), Draft IRWMP Plan Guidelines, and the guidance included in this Request for Proposals (RFP).
- Please pay particular attention to required procedures and deadlines. Refer to the attached timeline for more information about the review and ranking process, fiscal agent selection, and proposal development.
- All project proponents who wish to have their projects considered for Round 2 Implementation funding must submit their project(s) using the online upload form first (unless you have already done so): <http://inyomonowater.org/members/project-upload/>.
- **Round 2 Implementation pre-proposals** (those proposals used for internal ranking) **are due to the Program Office**. Also become familiar with the Implementation PSP before starting your pre-proposal so that you understand what is expected of projects and project proponents. **Please submit pre-proposals as Word documents. We suggest using the attached application worksheet (starting on p. 5) as a template for your pre-proposal.**
- With regards to the Implementation PSP section in the pre-proposal, a fully-developed proposal is not necessary. Reviewers will be looking for the minimal amount of information necessary to respond to the questions in the Implementation PSP Table starting on Page 4. However, providing responses to all of the scoring criteria/questions is highly recommended.

Scoring of Proposals and Allocation of Funding

- **Category-specific TACs will meet and evaluate proposals for that category only.** *TACs will evaluate the entire Implementation PSP section of each pre-proposal up to 80 points.* TACs are encouraged, in addition to providing the scores of each project evaluated, to provide a narrative explanation of its scoring/ranking of the proposals. TAC members do not necessarily need to be RWMG Members.
- **TACs will provide their scoring and rankings to the Program Office.** Program Office will then provide this information to project proponents and the RWMG. If project proponents wish to respond to the TAC rankings, they may do so any time before November 1, 2012, and those responses will be made available to the group of project reviewers.
- RWMG ranking of projects will occur within bins (or categories). There will be no overall ranking of projects. (Conditional upon decision below)
- Expenses required by fiscal agent to implement and administer the Grant Agreement with DWR will be subtracted from the total grant award with remaining funds going directly to support implementation projects.
- **Funding can be allocated in one of three ways:**
 - a) Implementation projects will be prioritized for funding based on the project's evaluation score, regardless of bins. Projects will be ranked from the highest score to the lowest score, and funding will be allocated accordingly. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
 - b) Implementation award will be allocated to the highest ranked projects within each bin.

Bins will be randomly prioritized, and the highest ranking project from the first priority bin will receive full funding and then the highest ranked project in the second priority bin will receive funding for their project and so on until the total award is allocated. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.

- c) Implementation award will be allocated to the highest ranked projects within each bin. Bins will be prioritized by the RWMG *before project ranking begins*, and the highest ranking project from the highest-prioritized bin will receive full funding and then the highest ranked project in the second-highest bin will receive funding for their project and so on until the total award is allocated. When there is insufficient grant money to fully fund the next project, the Program Office will discuss with funded project proponents how best to maximize the remainder amount so as to fund as many projects as possible. If needed to help resolve conflict, the Program Office will consult the Administrative Committee.
- Only RWMG Members are eligible to review and rank projects. Members wishing to review and rank projects must commit to reviewing and ranking ALL projects. RWMG reviewers may accept the TAC scoring for those specific sections for a particular project, or they may do their own scoring. If you accept the TAC scores, you must also review and score the other sections of the proposal not scored by the TAC.
- The highest aggregate score per bin will receive highest ranking for that bin. (Conditional upon process above)
- Contact the Program Office with any questions or for more information:
 - Mark Drew, Program Director
mdrew@caltrout.org; 760-924-1008
 - Holly Alpert, Program Manager
holly@inyomonowater.org; 760-709-2212
 - Janet Hatfield, Program Assistant
janet@inyomonowater.org; 760-387-2747

Round 2 Implementation Pre-Proposal Application

General Project Information

Project proponent:

☐ Yes ☐ No Is the project proponent a signatory of the planning/implementation MOU? If not, are there plans in place to become an MOU signatory on or before deadline for pre-proposal submission, or is the project proponent partnering with an MOU signatory? If project proponent is partnering with an MOU signatory, please list the name of the signatory. *As an MOU signatory, you have by default adopted the Inyo-Mono IRWM Phase II Plan.*

MOU Signatory Partner:

Contact person:

Phone:

E-mail:

Name of project:

County(ies) where the project will be implemented:

Watershed(s) where the project will be completed:

This project best fits into the following category (choose one, based on the Inyo-Mono regional Objectives [see p. 10 below for a list of Objectives]):

- ☐ Water Quality
- ☐ Water Supply
- ☐ Ecosystem Health
- ☐ Flood Management
- ☐ Groundwater

Project Abstract:

Provide a 300-word (or less) abstract summarizing the project

Scoring

The maximum amount of points available per proposal is 115. Pay particular attention to the allocated scoring for each section below and instructions pertinent to that section.

Implementation PSP (80 points for entire section; see individual scoring criteria for scoring guidance)

If you have difficulty reading the Scoring Criteria text, you can refer directly to Table 5 in the Implementation PSP:

http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/integregio_implementation.cfm

Table 5 – Supplemental Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards				
Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
<p>Work Plan</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific Work Plan that adequately documents the Proposal (i.e., suite of projects).</i></p> <p>Does the Work Plan contain an introduction that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) goals and objectives of the Proposal and how the Proposal helps achieve the goals and objectives of the adopted IRWM Plan? b) a map showing relative project locations; and c) a map showing relative project locations; and <p>Are tasks for each project of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented?</p> <p>Do the tasks include appropriate deliverables and reporting submittals (i.e., quarterly and final reports)?</p> <p>Is the proposal consistent with the applicable Basin Plan?</p> <p>Is this a study or part of a larger – multi-phased project effort? If so, will the proposed project(s) be operational as a standalone project(s) without the completion of the end project(s)?</p> <p>Does the Work Plan include a listing of required permits and their status including CEQA compliance?</p> <p>Does the Work Plan include Data Management and Monitoring Deliverables consistent with the IRWM Plan Standards and Guidance - Data Management Standard?</p>	3	0-15	0-5	<p>Standard Scoring Criteria</p> <p>See 2012 Guidelines, Section V.G</p>
<p>Budget</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific budget that adequately documents the Proposal.</i></p>	1	0-5	5	<p>A score of 5 points will be awarded where the Budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4; the costs are reasonable, and all the Budget categories of Exhibit B are thoroughly supported.</p>

Table 5 – Supplemental Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
<p>Are the tasks shown in the Budget consistent with the work items shown in the Work Plan and Schedule?</p> <p>Are the detailed costs shown for each project reasonable?</p> <p>Does the budget attachment contain an explanation of how the project costs were estimated?</p>			4	A score of 4 points will be awarded where the Budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the Budget categories of Exhibit B are not fully supported or lack detail.
			3	A score of 3 points will be awarded where the Budgets for most of the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B.
			2	A score of 2 points will be awarded where the Budgets for less than half the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking for all of the Budget categories described in Exhibit B.
			1	A score of 1 will be awarded where there is no detailed Budget information provided for any of the proposed projects.
			0	A score of 0 will be awarded where there is no Budget information provided.
<p>Schedule</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific schedule that adequately documents the Proposal and on the readiness to proceed with the Proposal. Readiness will be measured by construction cycles following the anticipated award date of September 2013. It is assumed in the Scoring Standards that the first construction cycle will begin April 2014, the second cycle will begin April 2015, and the third cycle will begin April 2016.</i></p> <p>Are the tasks in the schedule consistent with the tasks described in the Work Plan?</p> <p>Given the task descriptions in the Work Plan, does the schedule seem reasonable?</p> <p>How many construction cycles occur between the assumed agreement execution date and the start of construction or implementation for the</p>	1	0-5	5	A score of 5 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of at least one project of the Proposal no later than May 2014.
			4	A score of 4 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of at least one project of the Proposal no later than May 2015.
			3	A score of 3 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of at least one project of the Proposal no later than May 2016.
			2	A score of 2 points will be awarded if the schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of no project of the Proposal earlier than May 2016.

Table 5 – Supplemental Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
earliest of the Proposal's projects?			1	A score of 1 point will be awarded if the Schedule is not consistent with the tasks presented in the Work Plan and Budget, is clearly not reasonable. Readiness to begin construction or implementation will be disregarded.
			0	A score of 0 will be awarded if the schedule was not included in the application.
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented an adequate monitoring and assessment program including performance measures that will allow a determination of whether the objectives are met.</i> Do the output indicators effectively track project output? Are the outcome indicators adequate to evaluate change resulting from the project's implementation? Is it feasible to meet the targets within the life of the project(s)?	1	0-5	0-5	Standard Scoring Criteria See 2012 Guidelines, Section V.G
Technical Justifications of Projects <i>Scoring will be based solely on the technical justifications of project(s) with respect to claimed physical benefits. Magnitude of physical benefits will not be scored under this criterion. However, physical benefits must be clearly described and quantified (if applicable) as points will be allocated based on the quality of the technical analysis and supporting documentation in consideration of the type of benefit claimed. Scoring is designed to not bias types or sizes of projects with respect to each other.</i> Did the applicant provide information that clearly identifies and describes the physical benefits of each project included in the Proposal? Is the technical analysis appropriate and justified considering the size of the project and the type of benefit claimed?	2	0-10	4-5 3-4 2-3 1-2	A proposal that includes clearly identified and well described physical benefits and supporting documentation that demonstrates the project(s) is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits will be awarded a score of 4 or 5 points based on the adequacy of the technical justification of the project(s). A proposal that includes clearly identified and well described physical benefits, but lacks sufficient supporting documentation to demonstrate the project(s) is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits will be awarded a score of 3 or 4 points based on the adequacy of the technical justification of the project(s). A proposal that includes physical benefits that are not clearly identified and/or well described and lacks sufficient supporting documentation to demonstrate the project(s) is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits will be awarded a score of 2 or 3 points based on the adequacy of the technical justification of the project(s). A proposal that includes physical benefits that are not clearly identified and/or well described and little to no supporting documentation to demonstrate the project(s) is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits will be awarded a score of 1 or 2 points based on the adequacy of the technical justification of the project(s).

Table 5 – Supplemental Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
			0	A score of zero will be awarded to proposals that do not include supporting documentation to demonstrate the project(s) is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits.
<p>Benefits and Costs Analysis</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on the magnitude of benefits and quality of analysis. Magnitude will be evaluated relative to total proposal costs. For proposals where a cost effectiveness evaluation is provided, these evaluations will also be scored based on the quality and completeness of the evaluation. Scoring is designed to not bias types of projects with respect to each other.</i></p> <p>Points will be allocated based on: 1) the benefits realized through implementation of the Proposal relative to proposal costs and 2) the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrating those benefits.</p> <p>Are the costs and benefits claimed supported with clear and complete documentation?</p> <p>Is the benefit analysis appropriate considering the size of the project and the type of benefit claimed?</p> <p>Note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants may not split a single project into multiple smaller components or phases in order to be eligible for the Cost Effectiveness Analysis Option (Section D1). • Points may be reduced if DWR determines that the benefits described in the Non-Monetized Benefit Analysis (Section D2) could readily be quantified in dollar terms. This judgment may involve the type of benefit, the size of the project, and the availability of information. • If DWR determines that FDR project benefits can be monetized, but the applicant did not present the benefits, the applicant risks losing points. 	3	0-30	8-10	Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation.
			7-8	Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking.
			5-7	Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation.
			4-5	Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking.
			1-4	Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a low level of benefits in relationship to cost. Varying degree of quality of the analysis and supporting documentation.
			0	A score of zero will be awarded to proposals that do not demonstrate any level of benefit.

Table 5 – Supplemental Scoring Criteria and Scoring Standards

Scoring Criteria	Weighting Factor	Range of Points Possible	Score	Scoring Standards
<p>Program Preferences</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal will implement one or more of the specified IRWM Grant Program Preferences (See Section ILF). Proposals that demonstrate significant, dedicated, and well-defined projects that meet multiple Program Preferences will be considered more favorably than Proposals that demonstrate a significant potential to meet a single Program Preference or demonstrate a low degree of commitment or certainty to meeting Program Preferences.</i></p> <p>Did the applicant demonstrate a high degree of certainty that the Proposal will implement the Program Preferences claimed?</p> <p>Did the applicant document the magnitude and breadth of Program Preferences that the Proposal will achieve?</p> <p>Did the applicant include a project(s) that will address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the IRWM region?</p>	2	0-10	0-5	<p>One half point will be awarded for each Program Preference (including the Statewide Priorities listed in Table 1 of the 2012 Guidelines) that will be met through the implementation of the Proposal, with one exception. One full point will be awarded if the Proposal includes a project(s) that will meet the Preference: "Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the IRWM region" (DAC Program Preference).</p> <p>The maximum score of 5 points will be awarded only if the Proposal, upon implementation, will meet at least 8 non-DAC Program Preferences AND includes a project(s) that will meet the DAC Program Preference.</p> <p>If the Proposal does not include a project that will meet the DAC Program Preference, the maximum score that may be awarded is 4 points.</p> <p>Program Preference points will be granted if it is clear that the preference will be met upon implementation of the Proposal.</p>
Total Range of Points Possible Without Tie Breaker Points =		0 - 80		

Statewide Priorities (3 points for entire section)

State Water Plan Strategic Objectives

Please indicate which of the following objectives from the Water Plan Update 2009 this project addresses (check all that apply).

- ☐ Reduce Water Demand
- ☐ Improve operational efficiency and transfers
- ☐ Increase water supply
- ☐ Improve water quality
- ☐ Practice resource stewardship
- ☐ Improve flood management

Inyo-Mono Regional Priorities and Preferences (32 points for entire section)

Inyo-Mono IRWM Planning Priorities (20 points for entire section)

1. In the table below, put an “X” by each Inyo-Mono IRWM Plan Objective and Resource Management Strategy that the project supports. Include a one-sentence description justifying your answer for each. (5 points)

Regional Objective	Resource Management Strategies
<input type="checkbox"/> Protect, conserve, optimize, and augment water supply while maintaining ecosystem health	<input type="checkbox"/> Improve water supply reliability. <input type="checkbox"/> Improve system flexibility and efficiency. <input type="checkbox"/> Support compliance with current and future state and federal water supply standards. <input type="checkbox"/> Address local water supply issues through various techniques, including, but not limited to: groundwater recharge projects, conjunctive use of water supplies, water recycling, water conservation, water transfers, and precipitation enhancement. <input type="checkbox"/> Optimize existing storage capacity. <input type="checkbox"/> Conserve and adapt water uses to future conditions. <input type="checkbox"/> Capture and manage runoff where feasible. <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporate and implement low-impact development design features, techniques, and practices. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote public education about water supply issues and needs. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote planning efforts to provide emergency drinking water to communities in the region in the event of a disaster. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote water efficiency in fish hatcheries. <input type="checkbox"/> Protect water supplies that support public

Regional Objective	Resource Management Strategies
	recreational opportunities.
<input type="checkbox"/> Protect, restore, and enhance water quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Support achieving compliance with current and future state and federal water quality standards. <input type="checkbox"/> Improve the quality of urban, agricultural, and wildland runoff and/or mitigate their effects in surface waters and groundwater. <input type="checkbox"/> Support monitoring to better understand major sources of erosion and causes and, where feasible, reduce erosion and sedimentation. <input type="checkbox"/> Protect public and aquatic ecosystem sustainability. <input type="checkbox"/> Match water quality to water use. <input type="checkbox"/> Support appropriate recreational programs that minimize and/or mitigate impacts to water quality.
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide stewardship of water dependent natural resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Protect, restore, and enhance natural processes, habitats, and threatened and endangered species. <input type="checkbox"/> Protect, enhance, and restore ecosystems. <input type="checkbox"/> Support science-based projects to protect, improve, assess, and/or restore the region's ecological resources, while providing opportunities for public access, education, and recreation where appropriate. <input type="checkbox"/> Support research and monitoring to better understand the impacts of water-related projects on environmental resources. <input type="checkbox"/> Identify, develop , and enhance efforts to control invasive species.
<input type="checkbox"/> Maintain and enhance water, wastewater, emergency response, and power generation infrastructure efficiency and reliability	<input type="checkbox"/> Promote rehabilitation and replacement of aging water and wastewater delivery and treatment facilities in rural communities, including tribal lands. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure adequate water for fire protection and emergency response. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote and improve energy efficiency of water systems and uses. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote water efficiency in power generating facilities. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide for development and improvement of emergency response plans.

Regional Objective	Resource Management Strategies
<input type="checkbox"/> Address climate variability and reduce greenhouse gas emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase understanding of water related greenhouse gas emissions. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase understanding of impacts of climate change on water supplies and water quality. <input type="checkbox"/> Manage and modify water systems to respond to increasing climate variability. <input type="checkbox"/> Support efforts to research and implement alternative energy projects and diversify energy sources to move and treat water within the region. <input type="checkbox"/> Support efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the region. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote public education about impacts of climate change, particularly as it relates to water resource management in the region.
<input type="checkbox"/> Enhance participation of disadvantaged communities and tribal entities in IRWM process	<input type="checkbox"/> Engage regional communities and tribes in collaborative water and natural resource management related efforts. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide assistance for tribal and DAC consultation, collaboration, and access to funding for development, implementation, monitoring, and long-term maintenance of water resource management projects. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote public education and training programs in disadvantaged communities and tribal areas about water resource protection, pollution prevention, conservation, water quality, watershed health, and climate change. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote social resilience in disadvantaged communities and tribes to more effectively respond to social, economic or environmental disturbances impacting water-related resources.

Regional Objective	Resource Management Strategies
<input type="checkbox"/> Promote sustainable stormwater and floodplain management that enhances flood protection	<input type="checkbox"/> Characterize current stormwater and flood management situations and challenges. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote region-wide integrated stormwater and flood management planning. <input type="checkbox"/> Improve stormwater and flood management infrastructure and operational techniques/strategies. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote projects and practices to protect infrastructure and property from flood damage. <input type="checkbox"/> Integrate ecosystem enhancement, drainage control, and natural recharge into construction projects. <input type="checkbox"/> Develop and implement public education, outreach, and advocacy on stormwater and flood management matters.
<input type="checkbox"/> Promote sound groundwater and surface water monitoring, management, and mitigation in cooperation with all affected parties	<input type="checkbox"/> Support and implement state-mandated groundwater and surface water monitoring requirements, and other groundwater monitoring efforts. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote efforts to monitor, manage, and mitigate effects of groundwater-dependent projects. <input type="checkbox"/> Develop and support projects that mitigate for the effects of groundwater extraction. <input type="checkbox"/> Protect and improve the quality and quantity of stored groundwater supplies and recharge areas. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote conjunctive use projects. <input type="checkbox"/> Identify existing gaps in groundwater and surface water quantity data and undertake appropriate assessments/characterization studies. <input type="checkbox"/> Collect data and monitor groundwater and surface water supply variability. <input type="checkbox"/> Promote efforts to manage/design groundwater projects so that future impacts requiring mitigation are avoided.

2. Will this project benefit disadvantaged communities? If yes, list DACs that will benefit. Will the project benefit *only* DACs? If not, please give an estimated proportion of funding that would be used to benefit DACs. (If uncertain which communities qualify as DACs, contact Program Office staff.) (10 points)
3. Will this project involve or benefit Native American Indian Tribes? If yes, list which Tribes. Will the project benefit *only* Tribal communities? If not, please give an estimated proportion of funding that would be used to benefit Tribes. (5 points)

Project Status & Technical Feasibility (6 points for entire section, scored as a whole)

1. Is this a project under CEQA?
 - a. ☐Yes ☐No
 - b. If yes, what level of CEQA is required?
 - c. What is the proposed schedule for completing CEQA?
2. Is this a project under NEPA?
 - a. ☐Yes ☐No
 - b. If yes, what level of NEPA is required?
 - c. What is the proposed schedule for completing NEPA?
3. Is the project proponent able to commit a 25% funding match as required by the PSP, or will the proponent be seeking a DAC match waiver?
4. What are the local and regional permitting requirements (if any), and have they been met? If not, what is the current status of compliance and/or plan for complying with the requirements? If permits are required, when do they expire?
5. Will there be staff available for project implementation, or will they need to be hired?
6. What kinds of planning documents, outside of permitting, are necessary for the project, and are they complete? For example, engineering designs or blueprints, work plan, etc.
7. What other financial resources (internal and/or external) will be available to undertake the project and sustain it beyond the IRWM grant?
8. Does the project proponent have the authority or approval to implement the project (such as landowner approval; approval from governing board; or fee, easement, or license rights)?
9. What will be the status of achieving the appropriate approvals by September 1, 2013 (anticipated final award date)?
10. If approvals have not been granted by September 1, 2013, what is the proposed schedule for achieving such approvals?
11. Is there a labor compliance program in place?

Subjective Evaluation Narratives (limit responses to 100 words or fewer) (6 points for entire section, scored as a whole)

1. Will this project result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions? If yes, explain how.
2. Will this project contribute to developing or implementing adaptation strategies to respond to climate variability impacts on water resources? If yes, explain how.
3. Are there any expected negative economic or environmental impacts of the project? Please describe.
4. Does the project address public health and safety concerns? Please describe.
5. Will this project contribute to achieving compliance with regulatory requirements?
6. Does the project mitigate existing negative environmental conditions? Please explain.
7. What other sources of money will be used to contribute to the project?
8. What economic impacts will the project have to the project proponent and/or other involved stakeholders?
9. How will this project further implementation of the IRWM Plan and contribute to increased integration in the region?